

Minoru ARAKAWA et al.
Serial No. 09/726,224

Remarks

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject patent application are respectfully requested.

Applicants' representative wishes to thank Examiners Nguyen and Walberg for the courtesy extended during the personal interview of March 23, 2004. The substance of the interview is set forth in the remarks presented below.

The office action alleges that claims 24-54 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed. At the interview, Applicants' representative indicated that claims 43-53 would be canceled without prejudice or disclaimer in response to this requirement, but that reconsideration of this requirement with respect to claims 24-42 and 54 would be requested.

After further consideration, claims 43-54 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to advance prosecution. Applicants reserve the right to file a divisional application(s) directed to the subject matter of these canceled claims. The title of the application has been changed in view of the canceling of these claims.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the withdrawal of claims 24-42. For example, claims 1-9 and claims 24-42 are all directed to digital camera accessories comprising units that are selectively detachable/removably attachable and it is believed to be appropriate to examine these claims in the same application. However, while Applicants believe it is appropriate to examine these claims in the same application as stated, nothing in this response should be construed as a statement or admission regarding the patentability of claims 24-42 *vis-à-vis* the originally claimed invention.

Minoru ARAKAWA et al.
Serial No. 09/726,224

The drawings were objected to because Figures 6-8 do not illustrate the microphone described in the specification. As explained in the prior response and at the interview, an example microphone is shown in Figures 4 and 9 and its inclusion in the mechanical-type drawings of Figures 6-8 is believed to be unnecessary for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention. Applicants again request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection to the drawings.

Claim 16 has been amended to correct a minor informality.

Claim 19 has been amended to change "communication circuitry" to --transmitter-- to remedy the antecedent basis issue noted in the office action. As such, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

The amendments to claims 16 and 19 are not believed to raise any new issues. Accordingly, entry of these amendments is believed to be appropriate and is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 6-11, 13 and 16-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being "obvious" over Tanaka *et al.* (U.S. Patent Nos. 6,120,379 or 6,540,615) in view of Parulski *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,666,159). As discussed at the interview, Applicants traverse this rejection.

Independent claims 1 and 10 each describes a digital camera accessory that comprises a base unit and a camera unit. The base unit comprises a receiver for receiving video images and a connector for connection to a video game machine. The camera unit is selectively detachable from the base unit so that the camera unit is remotely locatable relative to the base unit. The camera unit comprises an image sensor and a transmitter for transmitting video images captured by the image sensor. As discussed at the interview, the Tanaka *et al.* patents (hereinafter

Minoru ARAKAWA et al.
Serial No. 09/726,224

collectively referred to as "*Tanaka et al.*") disclose a removable game machine cartridge 40A that includes a camera for capturing images that can, for example, be displayed on a display of the game machine. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion of, among other things, providing camera cartridge 40A shown in Figure 6 of *Tanaka et al.*, so as to comprise a base unit including a connector for connection to a video game machine and a camera unit that is selectively detachable from such a base unit.

The office action contends that Figure 13 of *Tanaka et al.* discloses communication circuitry configured to transmit captured video images. However, there is no specific identification in the office action of the components in Figure 13 that are alleged to constitute this communication circuitry. Should any rejection be maintained based on *Tanaka et al.*, Applicants respectfully request that the portions of *Tanaka et al.* alleged to correspond to the claimed communication circuitry be specifically identified.

Parulski et al. is cited in the office action as remedying various deficiencies of *Tanaka et al.* with respect to claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 10, 15, 16 and 19. As discussed at the interview, Applicants disagree. At page 7, lines 3 *et seq.*, the office action references the Figure 7 embodiment of *Parulski et al.* which shows a combined telephone/camera unit 48. In the operation of this embodiment, the user takes a picture by flipping up the flash unit 52 (*see* Figure 8) and pressing an image capture switch. The picture data captured by camera module 68 (*see* Figure 9) is stored in the memory unit 64 and displayed on display screen 56. To transmit the image, the user dials the telephone number of a desired fax machine that is to receive the image. The stored image is then converted to an appropriate fax standard and is transmitted to the receiving fax machine using the normal cellular telephone system.

Minoru ARAKAWA et al.
Serial No. 09/726,224

There is nothing in the Figure 7 embodiment Parulski *et al.* that would have made it obvious to modify Tanaka *et al.* to provide the claimed digital camera accessory. For example, there is no teaching or suggestion in this (or any other) embodiment of Parulski *et al.* with respect to a digital camera accessory comprising a base unit and a camera unit as claimed. Indeed, in the Figure 7 embodiment, Parulski *et al.* specifically describes providing a camera that is "combined" or integrated with a telephone. There is no suggestion, much less teaching, of a digital camera accessory comprising units that are selectively detachable from each other and thus Parulski *et al.* cannot remedy the deficiencies of Tanaka *et al.* in this regard.

Applicants note the reference at col. 4, lines 59 of Parulski *et al.* to a cellular "base unit." However, this base unit is part of the cellular telephone network and in no way relates to the claimed base unit of a digital camera accessory that connects to a video game system.

Applicants further note the reference on page 5 of the office action to receivers A, B and C and the alleged correspondence of these receivers to the claimed "base unit." First, these receivers are described with reference to an embodiment of Parulski *et al.* other than the Figure 7 embodiment initially identified in the office action. The office action does not explain how these receivers are to be integrated with the Figure 7 embodiment which is directed to sending pictures to a fax machine. Second, even assuming these receivers are considered to receive video images, there is no disclosure or suggestion that these receivers include a connector for connection to a video game machine or that the camera unit is selectively detachable from these receivers. Accordingly, these receivers cannot constitute the claimed base unit.

Applicants further note the disclosure of a clip-on electronic camera module 10 in the Figure 1 embodiment of Parulski *et al.* However, there is no suggestion, much less disclosure,

Minoru ARAKAWA et al.
Serial No. 09/726,224

that this camera module comprise units that are selectively detachable from each other as claimed.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed combination of Tanaka *et al.* and Parulski *et al.* would not have rendered the subject matter of independent claims 1 and 10 obvious.

The claims that depend from claims 1 and 10 are believed to be allowable because of their dependency and because of the additional patentable features contained therein.

By way of example, claims 6 and 16 describe that the receiver of the base unit receives captured video images transmitted by the transmitter of the camera unit when the base unit is connected to the video game machine and the camera unit is located remotely relative to the base unit. There is absolutely no disclosure in either Tanaka *et al.* or Parulski *et al.* regarding such operation of a base unit and a camera unit when the camera unit is located remotely relative to the base unit.

By way of further example, claims 7 and 17 describe that the housing of the base unit includes a slot for receiving the camera unit. Neither Tanaka *et al.* nor Parulski *et al.* disclose a digital camera accessory comprising a camera unit that is selectively detachable from a base unit, much less that the base unit include a slot for receiving the camera unit.

By way of still further example, claims 9 and 19 describe that the camera unit comprises a microphone and that the transmitter is configured to transmit sounds detected by the microphone. The office action notes that the Figure 7 embodiment of Parulski *et al.* is an integrated phone includes a microphone for detecting sounds and communication circuitry for transmitting the detected sounds. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the disclosure of

Minoru ARAKAWA et al.
Serial No. 09/726,224

a microphone for a phone would not have taught or suggested providing a microphone for a camera unit of a digital camera accessory that is selectively detachable from a base unit thereof.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed combination of Tanaka *et al.* and Parulski *et al.* would not have rendered claims 1, 2, 6-11, 13 and 16-19 obvious.

Withdrawn claims 24, 41 and 42 are each directed to a digital camera accessory that includes units which are removably attachable to each other. For reasons similar to those advanced above, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Tanaka *et al.* nor Parulski *et al.*, nor the proposed combination thereof, discloses or suggests such a digital camera accessory. Consequently, claims 24, 41 and 42 are believed to be allowable over these references.

The claims that depend from claims 24 are believed to be allowable because of their dependency and because of the additional patentable features contained therein.

Claims 1, 2, 6-11, 13 and 16-19 were rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-8 of Tanaka *et al.* U.S. Patent No. 6,540,615 in view of Parulski *et al.* Reconsideration of this rejection in light of the above comments regarding Tanaka *et al.* and Parulski *et al.* is respectfully requested.

Minoru ARAKAWA et al.
Serial No. 09/726,224

Applicants submit that the pending claims are allowable and early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____



Michael J. Shea

Reg. No. 34,725

MJS:mjs
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100